HAY O 3 TOTA SULLANDE TO STREET OF THE PROPERTY & TRADE HAPE

Corres. and Mail AF/3617 BOX AF

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

REPLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.116 - EXPEDITED PROCEDURE - TECH CTR 3600

Application of George A. Teacherson

Having Mailing Address: c/o Box 762, Palm Beach, Fla. 33480-0762 2425 S. Culpeper St., Arlington VA

Serial No. 09/912,285 Group Art Unit 3617

Filed: 7/24/2004 Examiner: Jules

Commissioner for Patents Mail Stop **AF** P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 RECEIVED

GROUP 3600

ARTICULATED RAILCARS HAVING BEARING AND PLATE COUPLING APPARATUS AND METHOD CLARIFICATION

Sir:

IN RE: the timely filed response to the Office Action **Final Rejection**Confirmation No. 5196. In the above-identified case, two (2) sets of claims were provided to the examiner.

The first set used the wording "low friction bearing." The second set of Amended claims used wording EXACTLY as EXAMINER demanded for allowable claims. The second set of claims begins in the middle of the response. Therefore, if examiner refused to allow the first set, the second set was provided so that the case can find allowance and be issued. This is Applicant's effort to advance the case to issue in the shortest possible time.

Telephone conversation with examiner revealed that examiner considered "bearing" to be anything including a table. Applicant then verbally re-clarified the case wording that 'bearing' was to be read as anything that allows the railcars to move on and off the device at will. Other taught elements kept the cars on the device when in use.

Therefore, although 'low-friction' probably has never been used either in the case nor on the telephone, the case is clearly about allowing railcars to move on and off the specialized device in the railyard at will. Therefore, this aspect of the case MUST have been fully and completely searched so to conform to statute.

Thus, examiner amendment replacing 'low friction' with 'means for removably attaching railcars' should be allowable. Applicant reiterates that the second set of claims is far too narrow for the technology disclosed. There must be fully searched wording that brings the complete aspect of the invention into allowance.

Please make an examiner's amendment. — Or allow the second set of claims.

Thank you,

George A. Teacherson, Inventor

Reg. Patent Agent

703/285-4161